



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

would their undeniably hard lot be softened, but the enemies of good government, religion, and social order would be deprived of one chief means of popular seduction.

"Yet we must not conceal that the deadliest blow of all has been given to clerical influence by the doubt, now almost universally entertained, of the morality of the priests. To such an extent has this weapon been brought to bear against them, that it would be hard to find an individual who believes in their moral purity!—hard to find, a single priest, who is not assailed on this subject by the mocking taunts, not of adults only, but even of boyhood. Nor is a justification of these taunts sought in proven transgression; priestly chastity is impugned simply on the ground that the denial of lawful marriage has rendered it an impossibility. But this is not all. Not only does the priest find himself personally exposed to derision on this score, but he has the pain of beholding how widely the assumed delinquencies of his class have contributed to open the flood-gates of vice among the once distinguishedly virtuous peasantry, inasmuch as the now gigantically increased immorality of all orders of society, is frequently justified by reference to the notorious lives of their spiritual guides, and the application of the proverb, 'like people, like priest,' forms the running commentary in every ethical discussion. Hence it is rare in our days to find a head of a Christian family, or even a thoughtful political economist, who does not deem the most imperatively called for measures for the prevention of universal immorality to be the effectual removal of all suspicions of priestly unchastity. The Word of God is now fettered by the vices, whether real or supposed, of those who proclaim it; and if a reform be not speedily introduced, by which, on the one hand, the priesthood shall be secured a suitable support, without being a burden on the poor, and, on the other, be freed from the suspicion of practising the most infamous and destructive vices; by which, in short, we clergy shall be restored to our proper position in the social circle, and enabled to re-occupy with honour our place in the family, the Church, and the world—unless such reform be brought about, our hopes of usefulness are null and void; religion itself is given over to contempt, the hierarchy hangs on the verge of an annihilatory fall, and the State of its overthrow."

"Our humble and earnest petition, therefore, is, that you, Right Reverend Father, may be pleased, in conjunction with the high episcopate and the Imperial Government, to originate measures by which the evils which are now undermining clerical influence, and which threaten the ruin of both Church and State, may be removed, lest the people at large should be tempted to look to the revolutionary party as their sole hope, and be led to bless even the enemies of God and good order, if their political wisdom release them from so intolerable a state of things."

What a picture of Roman Catholic countries on the Continent does the foregoing document, coupled with the extracts from John Baptist Von Hirscher in a former page, exhibit. We earnestly trust that this remarkable movement may be the forerunner of a new Reformation, which alone, we are persuaded, can long avert the tide of infidelity from sweeping over Christendom, and hurrying into its terrible vortex the great mass of the educated Roman Catholics of Europe.

THE PROGRESS OF MIRACLES.

ALL France is honoured by another miracle. It occurred close on the fêtes of Cherbourg. A peasant girl, of the French Pyrenees, was engaged in her ordinary pursuits, when suddenly a figure appeared to her in a grotto, whom she had no difficulty in recognising. The figure was the Virgin Mary. That was one miracle; but it was followed by another. The grotto was very pretty before, but it now became useful. It had previously no water; now a spring was bestowed upon the inhabitants of the Pyrenean parish. Infidels and Protestants might not believe in the figure whom they had not seen, but the spring, at least, was within the grasp of their degraded intellects. A commission has been employed to examine the story. The members are charged particularly to test the water of the well. If it should have the slightest pretence to the honour, it is to be sold in bottles for the benefit of this district. Perhaps it may be more profitable to sell the water in another way. A village might be built there. A shrine might be formed. If the place have the slightest claim for natural beauty, that should not be difficult. Devotees would take the ground consecrated in this peculiar manner. That mode, moreover, of turning this girl's vision into permanent profit might have another advantage. It would compel the girls of other towns to examine grottoes with attention and care. It might elicit other miracles. There is abundance of space on the Pyrenees for small villages of pretty houses, with neat gardens, capable of being used as summer retreats, not only in the common, but the ecclesiastical meaning of the word "retreats." Penance on the Pyrenees would be lightened by the change of scenery to the inhabitants of Lyons or of Paris. They would descend to the car-

and labours of the plains doubly invigorated. They would derive health of body and of mind by their exercises, their meditations, and, if necessary, their stripes; but the latter would be light in these mountains. No doubt other and envious parishes and villages would establish rivals. So much the better. Too many miracles will not occur. Cardinal Wiseman is now in Ireland. There he proclaims the cold want of enthusiasm that freezes him in England. He sees it in the rigid features of the stolid crowd. Nothing will move them. His eloquence falls on adamant or flint, or, at the best, granite like that of the Mourne Mountains; but when he reaches Ireland he is refreshed by enthusiasm, by smiles, by tears, by fervour, and gratitude, and warmth—by faith, of which, nevertheless, he holds that Martin Luther made a bad use. He first learned the English language, he says, in Ireland; and he is like the old classic gentleman who gathered new strength and vigour always when he fell on his mother earth. The Cardinal returns to England from Ireland refreshed—a new man, with a store of vigour for England to wear out. It may be all natural and true; but, while France finds, Ireland loses, "the holy wells." They were places of pilgrimage there long ago, and they are now forgotten. The peasant passes around them behind his plough, instead of on his knees. Devotees do not look there for blessings. They do not go there in payment of their vows. Ireland retrogrades, France progresses. In the matter of holy wells France is in the year 1558 as contrasted with Ireland. This is a fact which Cardinal Wiseman should not overlook. To Rostrevor, or a Wicklow mountain, an event like that of the Pyrenees would be a fortune.—*Glasgow Bulletin*.

Correspondence.

ST. PAUL'S VISIT TO ST. PETER.—GAL. I. 18.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—If the theory of Peter's supremacy be true, it is truly astonishing that we find such little trace of it in the New Testament. Neither in the Acts of the Apostles do we read of the other Apostles receiving commands or instruction from St. Peter, nor do we find St. Peter himself in his epistles claiming any superiority; nor do we find the other Apostles, in their epistles, acknowledging themselves indebted to him for any part of their teaching. One of the few passages which a Roman Catholic may imagine favourable to his views is that which I have prefixed to this letter, in which Paul mentions that he took a journey to Jerusalem to see Peter; on which three words a lively imagination may build a very extensive fabric. But I think I shall show that these words, when taken in connection with the context, afford a very striking proof that neither St. Paul himself, nor those whom he addressed, had the least idea of any such superiority in kind, of St. Peter to the rest of the Apostles, as modern Romanists maintain.

In the first and second chapters of the epistle to the Galatians, the principal topic is, that St. Paul is asserting his claim to apostleship *independently* of the other Apostles, and by direct appointment from Christ; and he declares that his knowledge of Christian doctrine was derived, not from their teaching, but by direct revelation from the Lord Jesus, ch. i., v. 12. "I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of men, neither was I taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." He goes on to say that on his conversion he did not go up to those who were Apostles before him, but went to Arabia, and then returned to Damascus; that it was three years afterwards when he first paid a visit to Jerusalem; that this visit was only for a fortnight, and that on that occasion he saw only two of the Apostles, Peter and James. That after that he went and laboured in Syria and Cilicia, and that all this time the Christians of Judea did not even know him by face, and that it was fourteen years after when he went back to Jerusalem and met the rest of the Apostles and heads of the Jerusalem Church, who, when he compared his doctrine with theirs, could give him no additional information which he had not possessed before.

Now, take all this statement in its connection, and with reference to the object for which it was made, and what inference are we to draw from the admission, in verse 18, that Paul made a visit to Peter? If all the Apostles were then believed by everybody to be of equal authority, everything is intelligible. The substance then is—"I did not derive my doctrines from the Apostles; for, for the first fourteen years I was preaching, out of the whole twelve I never met more than two, Peter and James, and that only for a fortnight." This is all very well, if Peter had only the same kind of authority as the rest. But suppose that St. Paul or his readers had heard the theory, that Christ had made one man the earthly head of His Church, and its infallible guide to true doctrine, how could he, in the same breath, assert that he had not received his doctrines from man, and yet say that he had gone up to that man and received his instructions.

Let us suppose that in the present day some one in China were to claim to have been miraculously instructed in the Christian faith, and to say in proof of such a claim that he had been for several years preaching the Gospel before

he had ever met any Christian missionary. But what should we think if he were to add—it is true I had paid a short visit to Rome, but I did not converse with any Christian priests there *except the Pope*. Roman Catholics would certainly feel that he did not attach the value which he ought to the Pope's instructions.

I don't know, sir, whether I make my meaning understood, so perhaps I had better try a more humble illustration. Suppose a schoolmaster were to ask one of his boys if he had written his exercise without assistance, and if the boy were to answer—"Oh yes, sir, I did it all myself; there was not one of the other boys near me when I was doing it except Peter." Would this be a sensible answer, supposing that Peter was the very boy whom the master knew to be most able and most likely to give him help? In such a case would not the master answer—"If you own to having had Peter near you, I don't care whether any of the other boys were near you or not."

I say that the present case is like the illustration I have used. St. Paul in trying to show that he had never availed himself of human instruction in order to attain his knowledge of the Christian faith, after admitting that he had had some intercourse with Peter, goes on to protest solemnly that he had not seen the other Apostles. "Other of the Apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother. Now the things which I write unto you, behold before God I lie not." Does not he show here most forcibly that he did not regard Peter as the sole source of information as to the Christian faith—the sole infallible guide to truth? Does he not imply, that if his object had been to get instruction from human sources, he would not have been satisfied with seeing Peter, but would have waited and taken pains to consult the other Apostles? And does not the confidence with which he writes prove convincingly that no such notions were then entertained about Peter as have been invented in later times? The Apostle is not in the least apprehensive that it would come into the head of any of his readers to say (as a Roman Catholic now would certainly feel)—If you own to having had communication with Peter, I do not care whether or not you consulted the other Apostles.

I believe, then, sir, that the whole passage is a very strong proof that the exaltation of Peter to a place high above the level of the other Apostles was utterly unknown at the time when the epistle to the Galatians was written.

I am, your obedient servant,
R. H. B.

THE HOLY FATHERS ACKNOWLEDGE THE POPE'S SUPREMACY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

(Continued from page 105.)

XIV. About the same time, Pope Julius thus writes to the Oriental Bishops: "Know ye not that it is the custom first to write to us, that what is just may be judged? Wherefore, if any suspicion of this kind attach to a Bishop, it is fit to refer it here. What we have derived from the holy Apostle Peter, this I announce to you, and not otherwise, as, I presume, you already know." (Apud. St. Athanas. Apolog. 2, cont. Arian. tom. i. p. 153.)

XV. Pope Julius further showed his supremacy: First, in citing the Patriarch, St. Athanasius of Alexandria, that is of the 2nd Patriarchal See, to a Council at Rome, anno 341, which his enemies, by their envoys, had sought of the Pope, as St. Athanasius himself testifies; and which is also testified by Theodoret.^b Secondly, in restoring both St. Athanasius and other Oriental Bishops whom the Arian faction had expelled, as Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, Asclepas, Bishop of Gaza, in Asia Minor, to their Sees, as far as spiritual authority alone could reach; that is, by a judicial declaration of their being the only lawful Bishops of them. This is testified by the Greek historians, Socrates and Sozomen.

XVI. Sozomen, speaking of Marcellus, Asclepas, St. Lucius, Bishop of Adrianople, and St. Paul, of Constantinople, says: "The Bishop of Rome having taken cognizance of them, received them into his communion; and because by reason of the dignity of his See, the care of all belonged to him, he restored them to their respective Sees."^c

XVII. And Socrates: "When Athanasius, Paulus, Asclepas, Marcellus, and Lucius had opened their cause to Julius, he, according to the prerogative of the Roman See, sent them back into the East with the protection of his letters, and restored to each of them his See."^d

XVIII. St. Hilary of Poitiers, writing to the same Pope Julius, says: "The best, and by far the fittest course, is, that the Lord's priesthood, from each and every province, should refer to the head; that is, to the See of the Apostle Peter."^e

XIX. To these positive testimonies of the supreme jurisdiction of the Roman Bishop before the middle of the 4th century, add that of the heathen author, Aunianus, who says that Constantius, the enemy of St. Athanasius, "earnestly wished to have him condemned, by the authority which the Bishop of Rome had over all others." (Lib. 16.)

XX. At the general Council at Sardica, anno 347, "The Bishop Hosius said: 'If a deposed Bishop shall fly to the most blessed Bishop of the Church of Rome; and if the same should think it just to re-examine his cause,

^a Lib. I. Hist. c. 13.

^b Lib. 2. c. 15.

^c Lib. 2. c. 3.

^d Lib. 3. c. 8.

^e Inter Fragment a 2, in appendix.